
The influence of Plato's *Crito* and *Phaedo* on Xenophon's *Apology of Socrates*

Boris Hogenmüller



Electronic version

URL: <http://journals.openedition.org/kentron/347>

DOI: 10.4000/kentron.347

ISSN: 2264-1459

Publisher

Presses universitaires de Caen

Printed version

Date of publication: 1 November 2015

Number of pages: 127-138

ISBN: 978-2-84133-747-7

ISSN: 0765-0590

Electronic reference

Boris Hogenmüller, « The influence of Plato's *Crito* and *Phaedo* on Xenophon's *Apology of Socrates* », *Kentron* [Online], 31 | 2015, Online since 19 October 2016, connection on 17 November 2020. URL : <http://journals.openedition.org/kentron/347> ; DOI : <https://doi.org/10.4000/kentron.347>



Kentron is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 3.0 International License.

THE INFLUENCE OF PLATO'S CRITO AND PHAEDO ON XENOPHON'S APOLOGY OF SOCRATES¹

The relationship between Plato and Xenophon has been the subject of research for many years. During the late 19th and early 20th century, the result of this research, especially in terms of the 'Sokratesbild', was always the same, and Xenophon's dependence on the *logoi Sokratikoi* written by Plato and Antisthenes has always been quite obvious². In the middle of the 20th century, however, new studies have given rise to another opinion³, which made the case for dependence of Xenophon on other Socratics. Thus L.-A. Dorion's statement (« *Xénophon dépend des autres Socratiques: il ne constitue pas une source indépendante* »⁴), although he attempts to refute it⁵, seems more appropriate today than ever before. In those writings, Xenophon obviously appears as a Socratic and is always represented as a late representative, who, among others, could draw on Plato's already published writings. This can be seen best by examining Xenophon's *Symposium*. B. Huss recently⁶ dated Xenophon's *opus* with reference to the proven dependence on Plato's *Symposium*⁷ and *Phaedrus* – written 365 or 369-362 BC⁸ – in the second half of the 360s⁹.

-
1. I would like to thank William H.F. Altman for his help – for reading this paper, correcting my English, and especially for all his statements which I really appreciate.
 2. Cf. Dupréel 1922, 337-341; see also Delebecque 1957, 392; Pontier 2006, 217-224; for the dependence on Antisthenes, cf. Gera 1993, 8: "Antisthenes' Cyrus may have been the most influential factor when Xenophon chose the Persian ruler as the central axis of his didactic work", and Mueller-Goldingen 1995, 25-44.
 3. Cf. among others Taylor 1932, 33, n. 1; Simeterre 1938, 5, n. 11; Field 1930, 145; Luccioni 1953, 79, n. 3; Cooper 1999, 9-10; 27, n. 48.
 4. Cf. Dorion 2000, LII-LXV, chapter 2.7.
 5. Cf. Dorion 2000, XLIII: « *En raison du naufrage de cette littérature socratique, nous ne sommes plus en mesure d'identifier les sources présumées de Xénophon ni d'évaluer l'étendue de sa dette, si dette il y a, à leur endroit* ».
 6. Cf. Huss 1999, 13-18.
 7. Cf. Dakyns 1890-1897, III 1, LX-LXVII; Hug & Schöne 1909, XXVIII-XXX; Bury 1932, LXVIII, n. 1; Wimmel 1957; Thesleff 1978.
 8. Cf. de Vries 1969, 7-11; Ledger 1989, 209-210; 224; Heitsch 1993, 233; see also Thesleff 1982, 171-180; Brandwood 1990, 251 and n. 9.
 9. Cf. Marschall 1928, 72-75; 83-85, 102; Woldinga 1938, 189; Delebeque 1957, 346.

But the influence of some earlier Platonic works is also present in Xenophon's rather less studied first work, the *Apology of Socrates*, and this likewise suggests Xenophon's dependence on Plato¹⁰. In addition to Plato's *Apology of Socrates*, there are two more Platonic writings devoted to the aftermath of Socrates' trial – *Crito* and *Phaedo* – that have influenced Xenophon's *opusculum*. Where and in which manner Xenophon depended on these two Platonic dialogues in his *Apology* will be the subject of this short essay. First of all, the structure and the content of the *Apology* will be briefly considered, thereby providing easier access to the problem.

Structure of Xenophon's *Apology of Socrates*

Xenophon's *Apology* begins with some kind of a preface, in which he describes the purpose of his small writing, using a brief authorial justification of the decision to write a defense of Socrates. As the main argument, he points out the absence of a plausible explanation in other so called *Apologies* that could justify Socrates' preference of death. In his point of view this lack leads to the problem that Socrates' *μεγαληγορία* is seen in a wrong context, although Hermogenes, the companion of Socrates, seems to prove the appropriateness of the term in connection with the ideas of Socrates (§ 1-2).

In the following chapters, with reference to the narrative of Hermogenes, Xenophon lists the decisions Socrates made immediately before the trial that convinced him not to give a defense speech in court (§ 2-10). After a sudden change of scene, and by turning to the actual trial, the words of the speech for Socrates' defense then follow verbatim. According to Xenophon, Socrates should have spoken those in front of the judges (§ 11-21). In paragraphs 22-23, Xenophon – using the same authorial voice with which he began – tells how Socrates acted after the guilty verdict: he both refused to specify a punishment for the crime of which he

-
10. I don't agree with William F. Altman's thesis that especially Xenophon's *Apology* is the model for Plato's more detailed and better composed homonymous writing. In my opinion Altman doesn't reflect on the problem of chronology and Xenophon's motivation exactly. If Xenophon had written his *Apology* first, this should have happened after 399. But during most of this time Xenophon was in Asia together with Agesilaos and probably not able to write continuous. Just after his banishment from Athens (after 394) the situation changed, and it seems possible that Xenophon had enough time for writing. But unfortunately there are no evidences that Xenophon has started to write so early. The most writings of Xenophon were composed after 371 BC. I agree with Altman that Xenophon's *Apology* should be considered the first work of Xenophon; and for – in my opinion – good and plausible reasons I see the genesis of his *Apology* in the time between 385 and 371 BC in Skillous – before the *Memorabilia* –, but written after and in obvious dependence on Plato's *Apology*, *Crito* and *Phaedo*. This can be seen best by comparing the parts of similar content in Plato and Xenophon – see the detailed exposition of my doctoral thesis *Xenophon, Apologie des Sokrates. Ein Kommentar* (Hogenmüller 2008, 77-147).

had been found guilty, and prevented his companions from doing so. Likewise, he rejected the proposal of his companions to escape from prison (§ 23). Thereafter, Xenophon makes Socrates resume his speech after the verdict of guilty (§ 24-26), where he ends by professing his innocence once again. The day will come when his name will be praised (§ 26).

Hermogenes now reports that Socrates tried to eliminate the obvious grief of his friends over his conviction by two exhortations, first in general, and directed at all his companions (§ 27), and then one addressed to Apollodorus in particular (§ 28). Paragraph 29 marks an incision. From there on, Xenophon offers no more 'eyewitness accounts', but only anecdotes that tell about the person Socrates according to the Socratic tradition (§ 29-32). Xenophon ends the *Apology* with a summary of Socrates' attitude towards the judges, followed by a brief praise for the Master (§ 32-34).

The two passages, in which Xenophon has probably resorted to information from Plato's *Crito* and *Phaedo*, are found in the central part of the *Apology* (§ 23) and at the end of the anecdotal part (§ 28) after the verdict of the judges.

Apology 23 – Crito 43a-53a, Phaedo 99a

Xenophon's transition from Socrates' cross-examination by Meletus to the events after the verdict of guilty takes place in little more than a single paragraph (*Apology* 22-23). Xenophon himself reports that in refuting the charge of impiety, other arguments of Socrates and his friends¹¹ – the so-called συνήγοροι in the trial – have been put forward in his interest (ἐρρήθη δῆλον ὅτι τούτων πλείω ὑπὸ τε αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν συναγορευόντων φίλων αὐτῷ)¹², which, however, would not contribute to any further proof that Socrates had neither sinned against the gods nor treated people unfairly. This fact had already emerged from the previous conversation with Meletos (ἤρκεσέ μοι δηλῶσαι ὅτι Σωκράτης τὸ μὲν μήτε περὶ θεοῦς ἀσεβῆσαι μήτε περὶ ἀνθρώπους ἄδικος φανῆναι περὶ παντὸς ἐποιεῖτο)¹³. According to Socrates' own opinion it was obvious to him that the time of his death has come (καὶ καιρὸν ἤδη ἐνόμιζεν ἑαυτῷ τελευτᾶν)¹⁴. This seems to be a result of Socrates' grotesque conviction. In *Apology* 23,18-23 there are further accounts of his strange behavior:

11. It remains inconclusive whether his friends acted as advocates for Socrates. Plato only reports that Socrates presented a reasonable punishment after the insistence of his friends (*Apology* 38b7-10); cf. Stokes 1997, 161.

12. *Apology* 22,10-11.

13. *Apology* 22,11-23,14.

14. *Apology* 23,15-16.

Πρώτον μὲν γὰρ κελεύόμενος ὑποτιμᾶσθαι οὔτε αὐτὸς ὑπετιμήσατο οὔτε τοὺς φίλους εἶασεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἔλεγεν ὅτι τὸ ὑποτιμᾶσθαι ὁμολογοῦντος εἶη ἀδικεῖν· ἔπειτα τῶν ἐταίρων ἐκκλέψαι βουλομένων αὐτὸν οὐκ ἐφείπετο, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐπισκῶψαι ἐδόκει ἐρόμενος εἴ που εἰδεῖεν τι χωρίον ἔξω τῆς Ἀττικῆς ἔνθα οὐ προσβατὸν θανάτῳ.

The reader of the *Apology* now finds himself at that point of an authentic trial. After the conviction (*Apology* 23,17: ἡ δίκη κατεψηφίσθη), the plaintiffs and the defendants were allowed to submit a request for punishment. This task was not very difficult for the victorious plaintiff of this trial, as he had already called for the death penalty in his written lawsuit¹⁵. The already condemned person had the right to ask for another kind of sentence, but that was all about the amount of punishment. At this point of the trial, an acquittal was out of the question, even if the defendant was truly innocent. If the accuser had requested the death penalty, the already convicted person could only demand an equivalent punishment in order to save his life. This put him in a position to give the judges the opportunity to decide for the more 'lenient' of the two applications. For the actual situation in the trial of Socrates, this meant that the defendant had to provide a sentence, which was equivalent to the required death sentence of the accuser¹⁶. However, according to Xenophon, Socrates did the complete opposite of what Xenophon mentions almost casually. Socrates did not even provide a counter-proposal (οὔτε αὐτὸς ὑπετιμήσατο) nor allowed one of his friends to do so (οὔτε τοὺς φίλους εἶασεν). In his view, such action would confirm that he was guilty (τὸ ὑποτιμᾶσθαι ὁμολογοῦντος εἶη ἀδικεῖν). Xenophon interprets this behavior as a justification for Socrates' realization that the time of his death had come (καὶ καιρὸν ἤδη ἐνόμιζεν ἑαυτῷ τελευτᾶν· ὅτι δὲ οὕτως ἐγίγνωσκε καταδηλότερον ἐγένετο, ἐπειδὴ καὶ ἡ δίκη κατεψηφίσθη).

Oddly, however, Xenophon mentions a second reason (ἔπειτα), which has nothing to do with the events that happened in the actual trial but rather constitutes a reference to an episode after the final sentencing in prison. When it was suggested to Socrates that he should be secretly rescued from prison by his friends, he refused to follow them, and even seemed to mock them by asking if they knew a place outside of Attica that would not be accessible for the death (τῶν ἐταίρων ἐκκλέψαι βουλομένων αὐτὸν οὐκ ἐφείπετο, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐπισκῶψαι ἐδόκει ἐρόμενος εἴ που εἰδεῖεν τι χωρίον ἔξω τῆς Ἀττικῆς ἔνθα οὐ προσβατὸν θανάτῳ).

15. Cf. Mensching 1963 (= fr. 51); Barigazzi 1966 (= fr. 34); also Strycker & Slings 1994, 84-85; Dorion 2000, 50.

16. In Plato's dialogue, Socrates mentions three alternatives to capital punishment: prison (37b8 δεσμός), paying a fine (37c4 χρήματα ἐκτίειν) and exile (37c4 φυγή); cf. Lipsius 1905-1915, 74-81; Busolt & Swoboda 1926, I 487; 555; II 1107-1110; Harrison 1971, 17-18; 177; Todd 1993, 140; Bleicken 1995, 287.

It seems quite interesting here that at this point and for the first time in the *Apology* Xenophon included information that definitely could not have been part of the actual trial, but, if it is regarded as authentic, describes events that most likely fall in the 30 days¹⁷ between judgment and execution. That Xenophon probably adopted this particular information from Plato's writings coincides with Paul Vander Waerdt's suspicion that Plato was the model for Xenophon's *Apology*. Plato himself mentions the plans of escape of Socrates' friends in the context of two dialogues concerning the actual trial *expressis verbis*: in *Phaedo* and *Crito*. In the *Phaedo*, Plato has Socrates only allude to the thoughts of his friends organizing his escape from prison¹⁸. In the *Crito*, however, he treats the intentions of the protagonist and eponym explicitly. Due to the message that the fateful ship from Delos was already near Sounion (*Crito* 43a) and would probably reach the harbor on the day of his visit in jail, Crito thought that Socrates' execution was imminent. From his point of view, it was therefore Socrates' last chance to escape from prison. The following fictitious¹⁹ conversation depicts a discussion between Crito, Socrates and the personified laws. During its course, it is proved that Socrates' escape is wrong²⁰, because it would do harm to the polis and break an earlier agreement (49e-53a). Thus escape would repay wrong with wrong and violate a Socratic principle.

In a tradition which was hostile towards Plato, the *Crito* was even cited as evidence for Plato's unfriendly dealings with contemporaries²¹, and also gave rise to allegations of plagiarism against Plato. Accordingly the words spoken by Crito in 45a to 46a in his attempt to persuade Socrates to escape, were originally spoken by Aeschines of Sphettos, but because of hostility towards Aeschines, Plato assigned them to Crito²².

The proximity between Xenophon's anecdotal episode and Plato's account of it in the *Crito* can certainly not be denied. This strengthens the presumption that Xenophon has used information offered in the *Crito* while writing his *Apology*. From

17. Cf. Xen., *Mem.* 4,8,2.

18. Cf. Plat., *Phaedo* 99a: ἐπεὶ νῆ τὸν κύνα, ὡς ἐγώμαι, πάλοι ἂν ταῦτα τὰ νεῦρα καὶ τὰ ὅσῃ ἢ περὶ Μέγαρο ἢ Βοιωτοὺς ἦν, ὑπὸ δόξης φερόμενα τοῦ βελτίστου, εἰ μὴ δικαιοτέον ᾤμην καὶ κάλλιον εἶναι πρὸ τοῦ φεύγειν τε καὶ ἀποδιδράσκειν ὑπέχειν τῇ πόλει δίκην ἢ τιν' ἂν τάττη.

19. It is questionable whether the performed position in the *Crito* should be claimed for the historical Socrates (cf. Effe 1976, 309; different Kahn 1996, 91). One also could point to some relations between the discussion of Hippias in Xenophon's *Memorables* (4, 4, 2 ff.) and the fiction of the 'Sokratesbild'. On the other hand, Plato was not present in prison and had thus the license to fiction.

20. Cf. Kahn 1989, 32-34.

21. Cf. Karystios of Pergamon in Athen. 506de = Dörrie-Baltes 36.2.

22. Source of this fact is Idomeneus [FGrHist 338F17A und B = anecd. 40. 41 Riginos 1976 = Dörrie-Baltes 37.1 = Diog. Laert. 3,36]. But it is still questionable whether it is the Epicurean or Idomeneus the historian (see Erler 1994, 244).

a chronological point of view, this possibility seems probable as well, because the *Crito* has often been seen as the first dialogue Plato had written before the *Apology*. However, solid evidence is not available²³: the reference to the ‘good constitution’ of Thebes and Megara (53b-c) cannot be dated to a time after 395²⁴ or after 370²⁵. Even within the Platonic works themselves, there are some points of reference²⁶ that can permit some true statements about the chronology²⁷. In any case, the emphasis on the compliance with the law may be seen as a response to the charges against Socrates, but the defense needs not be taken to as a response to Polycrates’ writing in the 390s²⁸. Although it cannot clearly be proven, a temporal proximity to the Platonic *Apology* to which the *Crito* is closely related, seems quite plausible on the basis of two allusions²⁹. A definite chronological classification, however, is not possible³⁰. But it is quite possible that the *Crito* was written at the same time as the *Apology*³¹.

Although the intention of his friends to persuade Socrates to escape from prison emerges less clearly in the Platonic *Phaedo* than it does in the *Crito*, the presumption that Xenophon may also have used the *Phaedo* for receiving further information used in the *Apology* is legitimate. Yet it is not only due to an allusive remark of Socrates in *Phaedo* 99a: the influence of the Platonic *Phaedo* can clearly be seen at another point of the *Apology*, that will be analyzed in the following part of this study.

Apology 28 – Phaedo 117d. 89a9-b4

The situation described in Ap. 28,1-3 fits best in the time after the conviction and before the upcoming execution concerning its content. Xenophon reports in this passage from a short conversation between Socrates and Apollodorus:

-
23. In general, it seems quite impossible to date the Platonic writings exactly as Brisson 2008, xvi sq. recently argued anew.
 24. Cf. Wilamowitz-Moellendorf 1920², 55, n. 1.
 25. Cf. Brisson 2008, xvi sq.
 26. Such as to the *Gorgias*: *Crit.* 46bc, in combination with *Gorg.* 473c-d.
 27. E.g. after the *Gorgias*, Book 1 of the *Republic*, *Meno*, *Phaedo* or even before the *Gorgias*; cf. Kahn 1996, 125.
 28. For another opinion, see Thesleff 1982, 208-209; Thesleff 1989, 20-21 with n. 76.
 29. *Crit.* 45b and 52c.
 30. The authenticity of the *Crito* seems also quite difficult. Meiser 1891 doesn’t ascribe dialogue to Plato for reasons of content (e.g., how does Socrates’ loyalty to the laws fit with Plat., *rep.* 517d-e?). Doubts about its authenticity are also found in Thesleff 1982, 209-210; Thesleff 1989, 9: “semi-authentic”, who sees it written by a close friend of Plato (he suspects Speusippos) in the 370s.
 31. A time of origin for the *Crito* around the year 386/385 or shortly thereafter is suggested by the fact that Plato had certainly written various dialogues simultaneously and in parallel. That the *Crito* is around the time of the composition of the *Apology*, therefore seems quite plausible.

Παρὼν δέ τις Ἀπολλόδωρος, ἐπιθυμητὴς μὲν ὦν ἰσχυρῶς αὐτοῦ, ἄλλως δ' εὐθήης, εἶπεν ἄρα· Ἀλλὰ τοῦτο ἔγωγε, ὦ Σώκρατες, χαλεπώτατα φέρω ὅτι ὁρῶ σε ἀδίκως ἀποθνήσκοντα.

The actual subject of this brief episode – Apollodorus' grief (χαλεπώτατα φέρω) having to see how Socrates unjustly dies (σε ἀδίκως ἀποθνήσκοντα) – constitutes no difficulty in understanding. The content of this formulation, however, sounds strange, as Socrates had been condemned to death, but at this point of the *Apology*, his execution is not imminent. Apollodorus' reaction, however, seems to imply this. Suspicion is warranted that Xenophon did not incorporate the present episode in the concept of the *Apology*. These suspicions are further confirmed when bearing in mind that this episode has no real connection either to the previously reported events, or to the following prophecy about the end of the son of Anytos. If Xenophon had not introduced this episode at this point, their absence would have been of no consequence to the overall structure of the *Apology*. The impression arises that this is an anecdote added by Xenophon whose original version was Plato's. And for good reason.

While Plato in his *Apology* doesn't report anything like the scene between Socrates and Apollodorus, an obvious parallel is found in the *Phaedo* where the following is reported about Apollodorus' shock at Socrates' fate (*Phaedo* 117d):

Ἀπολλόδωρος δὲ καὶ ἐν τῷ ἔμπροσθεν χρόνῳ οὐδὲν ἐπαύετο δακρύων, καὶ δὴ καὶ τότε ἀναβρυχησάμενος κλάων καὶ ἀγανακτῶν οὐδένα ὄντινα οὐ κατέκλασε τῶν παρόντων πλὴν γε αὐτοῦ Σωκράτους·

In Plato's description, Apollodorus is completely hysterical in the face of Socrates' upcoming death. He unceasingly wept before the actual execution (ἐν τῷ ἔμπροσθεν χρόνῳ οὐδὲν ἐπαύετο δακρύων), and after Socrates had drunk the cup of poison, Apollodorus had a complete emotional breakdown, which manifested itself in loud wailing and weeping (ἀναβρυχησάμενος κλάων καὶ ἀγανακτῶν). Even though he does not speak to Socrates himself, it can be assumed that Xenophon ascribed these words to Apollodorus in the *Apology* while telling an episode that could have immediately occurred before the execution. In this respect, the episode highlights the accuracy of the scene at the deathbed of Socrates as represented by Plato. The assumption that Xenophon's anecdote is in close connection with the events described by Plato in the *Phaedo* seems therefore plausible. And it is confirmed by another short sentence in the *Apology* providing Socrates' unique gestures (*Apology* 28.3-4):

Τὸν δὲ λέγεται καταψήσαντα αὐτοῦ τὴν κεφαλὴν εἰπεῖν·

It can be assumed that Xenophon wanted to illustrate Socrates' intimate relationship with his students, especially with his enthusiastic supporter (ἐπιθυμητὴς μὲν ὦν

ισχυρῶς αὐτοῦ) Apollodorus by this gesture of affection (καταψήσαντα αὐτοῦ τὴν κεφαλὴν). But it is doubtful whether this is an authentic version of that scene, since Plato recalls a very similar incident in the *Phaedo*. There Phaedo tells Echecrates about the conspicuous behavior of Socrates during his last hours (*Phaedo* 89a9-b4):

Ἐγὼ ἐρῶ· ἔτυχον γὰρ ἐν δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ καθήμενος παρὰ τὴν κλίνην ἐπὶ χαμαιζήλου τινός, ὃ δὲ ἐπὶ πολὺ ὑψηλοτέρου ἢ ἐγώ· καταψήσας οὖν μου τὴν κεφαλὴν καὶ συμπίεσας τὰς ἐπὶ τῷ αὐχένι τρίχας – εἴωθει γάρ, ὅποτε τύχοι, παίζειν μου εἰς τὰς τρίχας – [...] ἔφη·

Phaedo reported that he sat on a stool at the bedside of Socrates (καθήμενος παρὰ τὴν κλίνην ἐπὶ χαμαιζήλου τινός), while Socrates was sitting higher than he did (ἐπὶ πολὺ ὑψηλοτέρου). Sitting there Socrates stroked the head of Phaedo (καταψήσας οὖν μου τὴν κεφαλὴν), played with his hair at the nape (συμπίεσας τὰς ἐπὶ τῷ αὐχένι τρίχας) as usual (εἴωθει γάρ, ὅποτε τύχοι) and began to speak (ἔφη). As previously seen in Xenophon, Socrates' gesture in this context is clearly understood as an expression of affection for his companion Phaedo. Yet, one should bear in mind that Plato, in contrast to Xenophon, consciously included this short episode in his narrative. In Xenophon this episode is not connected either with the preceding or following events. This constitutes a clear contrast to Plato, where it is completely integrated in the structure of his writing. It also indicates that Plato and not Xenophon should be regarded as the creator of this fictional scene³². In short: it can be assumed that the words in the *Phaedo* had influenced Xenophon's depiction of this episode. That the *Phaedo* was written earlier than Xenophon's *Apology*³³ also suggests Xenophon's dependence on the Platonic dialogue.

32. Since Plato, as it can be seen from a remark in *Phaedo* (59b), was neither present in prison at the time neither of the conversation nor during the dying of Socrates, due to an illness, it seems hardly possible that he could report such events. Whether Phaedo's statement, however, can be regarded as authentic, remains open (Wilamowitz-Moellendorf 1920², 325, n. 1; different Guthrie 1969, 489, n. 2).

33. Some stylistic reasons suggest a proximity of *Phaedo* to the so-called middle dialogues of Plato. An affiliation to *Cratylus*, *Symposium*, *Phaedrus* and *Republic* is therefore probable. Like the *Cratylus*, *Phaedo* is estimated to have been written at the end of the first period after Plato's first trip to Sicily (387/376) and before the *Republic*. For a time around 387 BC or shortly thereafter, see Hackforth 1955, 7, between *Gorgias* and *Protagoras*, Ledger 1989, 224, Dixsaut 1991, 26-28, around 383-382, and for Thesleff 1982, 140-144, 237, around 380-375. Presumably, the *Phaedo* should be located after the *Meno*, as the theory of anamnesis obviously refers on *Meno* 77c. If the *Symposium*, to which there are links (see Dixsaut 1991, 27), is written before the *Phaedo* (see Thesleff 1982, 142-143), the *Phaedo* must be written – like the *Symposium* because of some anachronisms (193a) – after 385 (see Erler 2007, 174). Certainty, however, has not yet been achieved and will be perhaps unreachable in this special case – and also in general concerning the definite dating of the Platonic writings as well as those of Xenophon (cf. e.g. Brisson 2008, xvi sq.; Dorion 2000, lxiii).

Conclusion

The study of the listed passages provides a clear result. As can be seen, while composing his *Apology of Socrates* Xenophon had used information and episodes that had already been written down in Plato's dialogues *Crito* and *Phaedo*³⁴.

Even if S.R. Slings' statement that "when a passage in Xenophon is closely similar to one in Plato, Xenophon, as a rule, is the borrower and that he has no objection to deviating from his source in order to make the idea conform better to his own views"³⁵ is true for the *Apology*, Xenophon should not be hastily judged as a mere plagiarist. Indeed Xenophon obviously intended his working method to create a new form of Socratic literature, and did so in quite a free manner³⁶. He did not create a bad copy of the alleged original, but rather a work that represents in this specific case a psychological complement to the other existing *logoi Sokratikoi*.

BORIS HOGENMÜLLER

*Julius-Maximilians-Universität Würzburg,
Institut für klassische Philologie*

Bibliography

- BARIGAZZI A. (1966), *Favorino di Arelate. Opere. Introduzione, testo critico e commento*, Firenze, Felice Le Monnier (Testi greci e latini con commento filologico; 4).
- BLEICKEN J. (1995), *Die athenische Demokratie*, Ferdinand Schöningh (Uni-Taschenbücher; 1330), 4. völlig neubearbeitet und wesentlich erweitert Auflage (1st ed. : Paderborn – München – Wien, Schöningh, 1985).
- BRANDWOOD L. (1990), *The Chronology of Plato's Dialogues*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press (revised version of Brandwood's 1958 London thesis, *The Dating of Plato's Works by the Stylistic Method*).
- BREITENBACH H. R. (1967), « Xenophon von Athen », *RE*, IX A2, Stuttgart, Alfred Druckenmüller, Sp. 1567-1910.

34. I see the date of the *Apology* after 385 and before 371 BC [(2008) 146-147]. There is also a clear dependence of Xenophon on Plato's *Apology*, but discussion of this topic goes beyond the limited objectives of this study.

35. Cf. Strycker & Slings 1994, 76.

36. Cf. Breitenbach 1967, 1892.

- BRISSE L. (2008), *Platon, Œuvres complètes*, Paris, Flammarion.
- BURY R.G. (1932), *The Symposium of Plato, Edited with Introduction, Critical Notes and Commentary*, Cambridge, W. Heffer and Sons Ltd, 2nd Edition.
- BUSOLT G., SWOBODA H. (1926), *Griechische Staatskunde I-II*, München, C.H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung (Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft; IV, 1), Dritte Auflage.
- COOPER J.M. (1999), « Notes on Xenophon's Socrates », in J.M. Cooper, *Reason and Emotion. Essays on Ancient Moral Psychology and Ethical Theory*, Princeton (NJ), Princeton University Press.
- DAKYNS H.G. (1890-1897), *The Works of Xenophon*, London, Macmillan and Co.
- DELEBECQUE E. (1957), *Essai sur la vie de Xénophon*, Paris, C. Klincksieck (Études et Commentaires; 25).
- DIXSAUT M. (1991), *Platon. Phédon*, Traduction nouvelle, introduction et notes, Paris, Flammarion (Garnier Flammarion; 489).
- DORION L.-A. (2000), *Xénophon. Mémoires, t. I : Introduction générale. Livre I*, M. Bandini (éd.), L.-A. Dorion (trad.), Paris, Les Belles Lettres (CUF; 399).
- DUPRÉEL E. (1922), *La légende socratique et les sources de Platon*, Bruxelles, Les Éditions Robert Sand (Fondation universitaire de Belgique) – Paris, Agence générale de librairie et de publications – Londres, Oxford University Press, Humphrey Wilford.
- EFFE B. (1976), « Das Gesetz als Problem der politischen Philosophie der Griechen: Sokrates, Platon, Aristoteles », *Gymnasium*, 83, p. 302-324.
- ERLER M. (1994), « Epikur – Die Schule Epikurs – Lukrez », in G.B. Kerferd, H. Flashar, (Hrsg.), *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie. Die Philosophie der Antike*, 4/1. *Die hellenistische Philosophie*, Basel, Schwabe Verlag.
- ERLER M. (2007), *Platon*, in H. Flashar (Hrsg.), *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie. Die Philosophie der Antike*, 2/2, Basel, Schwabe Verlag.
- FIELD G.C. (1930), *Plato and his Contemporaries. A Study in Fourth-Century Life and Thought*, London, Methuen & Co. Ltd.
- GERA D.L. (1993), *Xenophon's Cyropaedia, Style, Genre, and Literary Technique*, Oxford, Clarendon Press (Oxford Classical Monographs).
- GUTHRIE W.K.C. (1969), *A History of Greek Philosophy*, vol. III : *The Fifth Century Enlightenment*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- HACKFORTH R. (1955), *Plato's Phaedo*, Translated with Introduction and Commentary, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- HARRISON A.R.W. (1971), *The Law of Athens. Volume II: Procedure*, Oxford, Clarendon Press (= London, G. Duckworth [Bristol Classical Paperbacks], 1998).

- HEITSCH E. (1993), *Platon, Phaidros. Übersetzung und Kommentar*, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht (Platon, Werke, Übersetzung und Kommentar; III, 4).
- HOGENMÜLLER B. (2008), *Xenophon, Apologie des Sokrates. Ein Kommentar*, Saarbrücken, Sudwestdeutscher Verlag für Hochschulschriften.
- HUG A., SCHÖNE H. (1909), *Platons ausgewählte Schriften. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt*, 5. Teil: *Symposium*, erklärt von A. Hug, 3. Aufl. besorgt von H. Schöne, Leipzig – Berlin, B.G. Teubner (Griechische und Lateinische Klassiker – Schulausgaben mit Anmerkungen).
- HUSS B. (1999), *Xenophons Symposium. Ein Kommentar*, Stuttgart – Leipzig, B.G. Teubner (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde; 125).
- KAHN C.H. (1989), « Problems in the Argument of Plato's *Crito* », *Apeiron*, 22 / 4, p. 29-43.
- KAHN C.H. (1996), *Plato and the Socratic Dialogue. The Philosophical Use of a Literary Form*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- LEDGER G.R. (1989), *Re-counting Plato. A Computer Analysis of Plato's Style*, Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- LIPSIUS J.H. (1905-1915), *Das attische Recht und Rechtsverfahren*, Leipzig, O.R. Reisland, 3 Bände (Reprographischer Nachdruck: Hildesheim, G. Olms, 1966).
- LUCCIONI J. (1953), *Xénophon et le socratisme*, Paris, PUF (Publications de la Faculté des Lettres d'Alger; 25).
- MARSCHALL T. (1928), *Untersuchungen zur Chronologie der Werke Xenophons* (Inaug.-Diss. München), München, Verlag J. Lehmaier.
- MEISER K. (1891), « Kritische Beiträge, I. Ist Platon der Verfasser des Dialoges Kriton ? », in *Abhandlungen aus dem Gebiet der klassischen Altertums-Wissenschaft Wilhelm von Christ zum 60. Geburtstag dargebracht von seinen Schülern*, München, Beck, p. 5-8.
- MENSCHING E. (1963), *Favorin von Arelate. Der erste Teil der Fragmente: Memorabilien und Omnigena Historia*, Berlin, Walter de Gruyter & Co (Texte und Kommentare; 3).
- MUELLER-GOLDINGEN C. (1995), *Untersuchungen zu Xenophons Kyrupädie*, Stuttgart – Leipzig, B.G. Teubner (Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft; 42).
- PONTIER P. (2006), *Trouble et ordre chez Platon et Xénophon*, Paris, Librairie philosophique J. Vrin (Histoire des doctrines de l'Antiquité classique; 34).
- RIGINOS A.S. (1976), *Platonica. The anecdotes concerning the life and writings of Plato*, Leiden, E.J. Brill (Columbia Studies in the Classical Tradition; 3).
- RYLE G. (1966), *Plato's Progress*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- SIMETERRE R. (1938), *La théorie socratique de la vertu-science selon les Mémoires de Xénophon*, Paris, Téqui (Textes et études d'histoire de la philosophie; t. I, fasc. 1).

- STOKES M.C. (1997), *Plato. Apology of Socrates. With an Introduction, Translation and Commentary*, Warminster, Aris & Phillips.
- STRYCKER É. de, SLINGS S.R. (1994), *Plato's Apology of Socrates. A Literary and Philosophical Study with a Running Commentary*, Leiden – New York – Köln, E.J. Brill (Mnemosyne. Supplement; 137).
- TAYLOR A.E. (1932), *Socrates*, London, Peter Davies Ltd.
- THESLEFF H. (1978), « The Interrelation and Date of the *Symposia* of Plato and Xenophon », *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies*, 25, p. 157-170.
- THESLEFF H. (1982), *Studies in Platonic Chronology*, Helsinki – Helsingfors, Societas Scientiarum Fennica (Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum; 70).
- THESLEFF H. (1989), « Platonic chronology », *Phronesis*, 34, p. 1-26.
- TODD S.C. (1993), *The Shape of Athenian Law*, Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- VRIES G.J. de (1969), *A Commentary on the Phaedrus of Plato*, Amsterdam, Adolf M. Hakkert.
- WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORF U. von (1919, 1920²), *Platon*. Band I: *Sein Leben und seine Werke*; Band II: *Beilagen und Textkritik*, Berlin, Weidmannsche Buchhandlung.
- WIMMEL W. (1957), « Zum Verhältnis einiger Stellen des xenophontischen und des platonischen Symposions », *Gymnasium*, 64, p. 230-250.
- WOLDINGA G.J. (1938), *Xenophons Symposium*. Bd. 1: *Prolegomena* (Diss. Vrije Universiteit te Amsterdam), Hilversum, J. Schipper.